

OCT 18 2007

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ESTEBAN VAZQUEZ HERNANDEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

PETER D. KEISLER,** Acting Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 07-71906

Agency No. A96-362-824

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted September 10, 2007***

Before: PREGERSON, THOMAS and RAWLINSON, Circuit Judges.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** Peter D. Keisler is substituted for his predecessor, Alberto R. Gonzales, as Acting Attorney General of the United States, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 43(c)(2).

*** This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Respondent's motion to dismiss this petition for review is construed as a motion to dismiss in part and a motion for summary disposition in part. So construed, respondent's motion for summary disposition in part is granted because the questions raised by this petition for review are so insubstantial as not to require further argument. *See United States v. Hooton*, 693 F.2d 857, 858 (9th Cir. 1982) (per curiam) (stating standard). Accordingly, this petition for review is denied in part.

We have reviewed the opposition to the motion to dismiss this petition for review for lack of jurisdiction, and we conclude that petitioner has failed to raise a colorable constitutional or legal claim to invoke our jurisdiction over this petition for review. *See Torres-Aguilar v. INS*, 246 F.3d 1267, 1271 (9th Cir. 2001). Accordingly, respondent's motion to dismiss this petition for review in part for lack of jurisdiction is granted. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(i); *Romero-Torres v. Ashcroft*, 327 F.3d 887, 892 (9th Cir. 2003); *Montero-Martinez v. Ashcroft*, 277 F.3d 1137, 1144 (9th Cir. 2002).

All other pending motions are denied as moot. The temporary stay of removal and voluntary departure confirmed by Ninth Circuit General Order 6.4(c)

07-71906

and *Desta v. Ashcroft*, 365 F.3d 741 (9th Cir. 2004), shall continue in effect until issuance of the mandate.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.

07-71906

OCT 18 2007

PREGERSON, Circuit Judge, dissenting:

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

I dissent. This case, and the 60 others like it filed today, will have an adverse effect on children born in the United States whose parent/parents are illegal immigrants. When a parent is denied cancellation of removal, the government effectively deports the United States-born children of that parent. This unconscionable result violates due process by forcing children either to suffer de facto expulsion from the country of their birth or forego their constitutionally-protected right to remain in this country with their family intact. *See, e.g., Moore v. City of East Cleveland*, 431 U.S. 494, 503-05 (1977) (“Our decisions establish that the Constitution protects the sanctity of the family precisely because the institution of the family is deeply rooted in this nation’s history and tradition.”); *Stanley v. Illinois*, 405 U.S. 645, 651 (1972) (recognizing that “[t]he integrity of the family unit has found protection in the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment”).

Furthermore, as a nation we should recognize that many who came here illegally and many children born of illegal immigrants serve and have served with honor and distinction in our military forces, and many have laid down their lives

07-71906

on the altar of freedom.

As I have said before, “I pray that soon the good men and women in our Congress will ameliorate the plight of families like the petitioner’s and give us humane laws that will not cause the disintegration of such families.” *Cabrera-Alvarez v. Gonzales*, 423 F.3d 1006, 1015 (9th Cir. 2005).